

HOUSE REPUDIATES BRYAN.

FALSIFIER, SAYS UNDERWOOD TO GREAT APPLAUSE.

Remarkable demonstration as Underwood denounces Bryan's accusation of subverting the reduction of duties—National Politics Involved.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2.—Having emphatically rejected William J. Bryan's views on wool in a recent caucus, the Democrats of the House today completed their repudiation of the Peerless loser with a notable demonstration. Even Bryan's supposed supporters and friends joined in the wild applause that greeted Representative Oscar Underwood and leader of the majority, when he denounced Bryan on the floor of the House. It was a personal triumph for Mr. Underwood and showed clearly that he is today one of the commanding figures in the Democratic party.

In the opinion of Washington's political observers, the inevitable effect of today's occurrence will be to give marked impetus to the Harmon Presidential boom. Bryan and Harmon and Bryan and Underwood are irreconcilable on the outside and to-day's developments, it is predicted, will strengthen the line that is already forming with the conservative Harmon-Underwood forces on the one side and the Bryan-Champ Clark-Woodrow Wilson alignment on the other.

To-day's unusual scene in the House of Representatives, rising to a question of personal privilege, declared that Mr. Bryan's authorized interview given out in Lincoln last night was false from beginning to end. In that interview Mr. Bryan charged that at the recent Democratic caucus on the cotton bill Mr. Underwood, owing to his financial interest in the iron and steel industry, had defeated a resolution proposing a revision of this schedule, that he had put himself at the head of the opposition of Speaker Clark's tariff revision program, and that he was on the outside with the latter.

It was apparent from the beginning that the House was entirely in sympathy with Mr. Underwood. For five minutes after he had risen to his feet and announced that he intended to answer the Bryan charges the big hall echoed with applause. The Democrats shouted, waved handkerchiefs, clapped their hands and stamped their feet. Then, as the majority leader proceeded to brand the Bryan arraignment as a lie born of the difference between Bryan and Underwood over the wool schedule, and to praise not only by his own statement but by the testimony of his colleagues, that he had repeatedly attempted to secure revision of the iron and steel schedule ahead of cotton and wool, the members of the Democratic side of the chamber acted like crazy men.

Not a voice was raised in Bryan's defense. Even Representative Claude Kitchin, the man mentioned in Bryan's interview as able to substantiate his attack on Underwood, repudiated the Nebraskaan absolutely.

At the conclusion of Mr. Underwood's statement he was forced to hold an impromptu reception on the floor of the House while practically every member on the Democratic side filed by to shake his hand.

In all the excitement Speaker Clark sat in the presiding chair apparently forgotten. He nodded his head when Underwood declared he had never been on the outside with the Speaker and that there was no possibility he ever would be. But it is hardly likely that Mr. Clark feels any too happy over the absolute repudiation of Bryan, who has long been his idol and who has been casting favoring glances upon Champ's Presidential aspirations.

Mr. Underwood after the noise had died down thanked his friends for the expression of confidence and then sent to the clerk's desk the resolution which he intended to move. While the clerk was reading it the House was unusually quiet.

The statements in that interview are absolutely false," cried the majority leader when the clerk had finished reading the interview.

If those reflections rested only on myself, I would not care to say a word to the House to answer them. But the statements contained in that article are a reflection on the only body of the Democracy that is in control. As the representative leader of this majority on the floor of the House I would be untrue to myself and to you if I did not arise and stamp and stamp and stamp with the brand of falsehood as you know they are.

"Now, as to the facts. The gentleman who has issued that statement, William Jennings Bryan, has charged that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, standing in the interests of a protective tariff, has led the House into lines unwarranted by the facts of the land. I know it is false; Mr. Speaker, you know it is false; and so do all the Democrats on this side of the House.

Then Mr. Underwood said to the House: "Mr. Bryan," he resumed, "says that my leadership on this side of the House could not stand in the North. So that I am a Democrat under my leadership that would ask for my resignation.

"Mr. Bryan insinuates that I attempted to prevent consideration of the iron and steel schedule first, by the coming of a bill from an iron and steel district and being personally interested in the manufacture of iron, I begged to ask them to relieve me from the burden of the iron and steel schedule first."

Again the racket broke loose. Mr. Bryan's erstwhile followers leading the applause.

"My colleagues of this committee sit on the floor of this House," Mr. Underwood resumed, "and they are here to sustain me in my statement. The reason that the committee did not take up the iron and steel schedule first was that the country was demanding a revision of the textile schedule—the wool schedule—which had not been revised for years, and the cotton schedule with its 33 per cent. of protection and proportionately as high. The iron and steel schedule has been out by the Wilson bill, again by the Dingley bill and again by the Payne bill, and although this schedule needs and will have a further reduction the committee decided it was wise to consider the other schedule first."

"We went into consideration of the wool schedule, but during the writing of that schedule by the majority members of the committee the suggestion was made, not by me but by another member of the committee, that the wool schedule be put in effect until we could ascertain what action the Senate and the President were going to take."

"I said to the caucus that I had no objection to the revision of the iron and steel schedule, that I had already stated I wanted these schedules taken up next. But I said in that caucus that at that time the Senate had not acted on the wool or free list bill, and that there was no telling what the Senate or the President would do. I therefore thought it unwise for the Democratic party to pledge itself to the course it intended to pursue the balance of the session until we could ascertain what action the Senate and the President were going to take."

"I said to the caucus that I had no objection to the revision of the iron and steel schedule, that I had already stated I wanted these schedules taken up next. But I said in that caucus that at that time the Senate had not acted on the wool or free list bill, and that there was no telling what the Senate or the President would do. I therefore thought it unwise for the Democratic party to pledge itself to the course it intended to pursue the balance of the session until we could ascertain what action the Senate and the President were going to take."

"I said to the caucus that I had no objection to the revision of the iron and steel schedule, that I had already stated I wanted these schedules taken up next. But I said in that caucus that at that time the Senate had not acted on the wool or free list bill, and that there was no telling what the Senate or the President would do. I therefore thought it unwise for the Democratic party to pledge itself to the course it intended to pursue the balance of the session until we could ascertain what action the Senate and the President were going to take."

"I said to the caucus that I had no objection to the revision of the iron and steel schedule, that I had already stated I wanted these schedules taken up next. But I said in that caucus that at that time the Senate had not acted on the wool or free list bill, and that there was no telling what the Senate or the President would do. I therefore thought it unwise for the Democratic party to pledge itself to the course it intended to pursue the balance of the session until we could ascertain what action the Senate and the President were going to take."

"I said to the caucus that I had no objection to the revision of the iron and steel schedule, that I had already stated I wanted these schedules taken up next. But I said in that caucus that at that time the Senate had not acted on the wool or free list bill, and that there was no telling what the Senate or the President would do. I therefore thought it unwise for the Democratic party to pledge itself to the course it intended to pursue the balance of the session until we could ascertain what action the Senate and the President were going to take."

"I said to the caucus that I had no objection to the revision of the iron and steel schedule, that I had already stated I wanted these schedules taken up next. But I said in that caucus that at that time the Senate had not acted on the wool or free list bill, and that there was no telling what the Senate or the President would do. I therefore thought it unwise for the Democratic party to pledge itself to the course it intended to pursue the balance of the session until we could ascertain what action the Senate and the President were going to take."

"I said to the caucus that I had no objection to the revision of the iron and steel schedule, that I had already stated I wanted these schedules taken up next. But I said in that caucus that at that time the Senate had not acted on the wool or free list bill, and that there was no telling what the Senate or the President would do. I therefore thought it unwise for the Democratic party to pledge itself to the course it intended to pursue the balance of the session until we could ascertain what action the Senate and the President were going to take."

TOOK BRIBE FOR PUBLIC GOOD.

WHITE WANTED TO EXPOSE THE LORIMER DEAL, HE SAYS.

Before He Did It He Tried to Get a Federal Job Through Lorimer—Wrote O'Neill Brown—That He Had Already Got His Share—Letter a New Phase.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2.—Representative Charles A. White, a member of the Illinois Legislature of 1900, which elected Senator Lorimer, explained to-day to the members of the Senate committee investigating Mr. Lorimer's election the ethical ground on which he accepted a bribe and a share in the jackpot fund to vote for Senator Lorimer.

White testified that his main idea was to expose the corrupt political conditions existing in Springfield. He admitted that the actual taking of money in consideration for his vote was dishonest and he regarded it, but he felt that the end justified the means. The only way to obtain the necessary information was to participate in the transactions. He had used the bribe money, it is true, for his personal expenses, but he had done this because he felt that his expenses in gathering this information should be repaid. He did not intend to make anything out of his exposure except expense.

"The actual voting and taking of money," White said, "was dishonest, but I believed that it would ultimately result in good."

"How did the people of Illinois receive any benefit if you used the money for your personal expenses?" asked Chairman Dillingham.

"They were benefited through the exposure of political conditions at Springfield," replied White.

White testified that all his efforts were directed toward obtaining evidence as to who furnished the money for the Lorimer election and for the jackpot fund. He told how he cultivated intimate relations with Representative Lee O'Neill Brown, leader of the Democratic faction in the Illinois Legislature, even to the extent of borrowing a hundred dollars from Brown. He testified about a trip he took with Brown during which he asked Brown who furnished the money for the Lorimer election.

"What did Representative Brown say when you asked him this question?" inquired J. J. Marble, counsel for the committee.

"He did not answer," White replied. After receiving \$1,000 from Representative Brown for voting for Lorimer and \$500 from Representative Wilson in St. Louis as his share of the jackpot, White said that he began to write a manuscript giving in detail his history of his experiences while a member of the Legislature. He told of his conversation with labor leaders in which he gave them the summary of his experiences. Some of them advised him to make the exposure, while others said that it would ruin him if he made it public.

White told of writing letters to Senator Lorimer and Representative Brown informing them of his intention to make an exposure of the alleged corrupt methods in the Lorimer election. He said that his purpose was to write a book which would obtain from them in reply letters which might incriminate them and which he could use as documentary proof in his exposure.

White's letter to Senator Lorimer, which was written on December 4, 1900, said that White was about to make arrangements for the publication of his history of his exposure, which would net him about \$250 a year. In reply Senator Lorimer wrote a curt note which acknowledged his letter and said: "I should be very glad to note your success as an author."

White related how he submitted his original manuscript, which contained about 30,000 words, to Doubleday, Page & Co. and to the Chicago Tribune, both of which refused to publish it. He said that he then sent it to the Illinois State Federation of Labor, which printed extracts from his manuscript on April 30, 1901.

Correspondence was introduced showing that White wanted Senator Lorimer to obtain for him employment in the United States secret service or investigation department. Charles Ward, secretary to Senator Lorimer, obtained a clerical place for him in the office of the United States attorney at Chicago, but White declined to accept. Letters from Representative Brown to White were also presented showing that Brown was under no obligation to him as he (White) had received as much as any other member from the Lorimer election fund and also from the jackpot, but that he would like the Senator's influence in obtaining employment in the secret service.

"This letter has never been put in evidence in any previous investigation," commented Judge E. G. Haney, counsel for Senator Lorimer, mentioning the existence of that letter before the witness was asked.

"I was not questioned about it," White replied. "Did you not realize," inquired Chairman Dillingham, "that in writing that reference to your receiving money for your vote was a confession?"

"Why did you not mention the fact that you were receiving money for your vote?" White said that he mailed this letter, but Judge Haney said he had never heard of it.

White gave the names of about fifteen of his associates in labor circles in Illinois to whom he told the story of his experiences in the Legislature. Some of these men were labor leaders and others were with whom White associated. Most of them will probably be subpoenaed by the committee in an effort to corroborate White's story.

White completed his direct testimony to-day. His cross-examination will begin when the committee reconvenes to-morrow morning.

TOOK BRIBE FOR PUBLIC GOOD.

WHITE WANTED TO EXPOSE THE LORIMER DEAL, HE SAYS.

Before He Did It He Tried to Get a Federal Job Through Lorimer—Wrote O'Neill Brown—That He Had Already Got His Share—Letter a New Phase.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2.—Representative Charles A. White, a member of the Illinois Legislature of 1900, which elected Senator Lorimer, explained to-day to the members of the Senate committee investigating Mr. Lorimer's election the ethical ground on which he accepted a bribe and a share in the jackpot fund to vote for Senator Lorimer.

White testified that his main idea was to expose the corrupt political conditions existing in Springfield. He admitted that the actual taking of money in consideration for his vote was dishonest and he regarded it, but he felt that the end justified the means. The only way to obtain the necessary information was to participate in the transactions. He had used the bribe money, it is true, for his personal expenses, but he had done this because he felt that his expenses in gathering this information should be repaid. He did not intend to make anything out of his exposure except expense.

"The actual voting and taking of money," White said, "was dishonest, but I believed that it would ultimately result in good."

"How did the people of Illinois receive any benefit if you used the money for your personal expenses?" asked Chairman Dillingham.

"They were benefited through the exposure of political conditions at Springfield," replied White.

White testified that all his efforts were directed toward obtaining evidence as to who furnished the money for the Lorimer election and for the jackpot fund. He told how he cultivated intimate relations with Representative Lee O'Neill Brown, leader of the Democratic faction in the Illinois Legislature, even to the extent of borrowing a hundred dollars from Brown. He testified about a trip he took with Brown during which he asked Brown who furnished the money for the Lorimer election.

"What did Representative Brown say when you asked him this question?" inquired J. J. Marble, counsel for the committee.

"He did not answer," White replied. After receiving \$1,000 from Representative Brown for voting for Lorimer and \$500 from Representative Wilson in St. Louis as his share of the jackpot, White said that he began to write a manuscript giving in detail his history of his experiences while a member of the Legislature. He told of his conversation with labor leaders in which he gave them the summary of his experiences. Some of them advised him to make the exposure, while others said that it would ruin him if he made it public.

White told of writing letters to Senator Lorimer and Representative Brown informing them of his intention to make an exposure of the alleged corrupt methods in the Lorimer election. He said that his purpose was to write a book which would obtain from them in reply letters which might incriminate them and which he could use as documentary proof in his exposure.

White's letter to Senator Lorimer, which was written on December 4, 1900, said that White was about to make arrangements for the publication of his history of his exposure, which would net him about \$250 a year. In reply Senator Lorimer wrote a curt note which acknowledged his letter and said: "I should be very glad to note your success as an author."

White related how he submitted his original manuscript, which contained about 30,000 words, to Doubleday, Page & Co. and to the Chicago Tribune, both of which refused to publish it. He said that he then sent it to the Illinois State Federation of Labor, which printed extracts from his manuscript on April 30, 1901.

Correspondence was introduced showing that White wanted Senator Lorimer to obtain for him employment in the United States secret service or investigation department. Charles Ward, secretary to Senator Lorimer, obtained a clerical place for him in the office of the United States attorney at Chicago, but White declined to accept. Letters from Representative Brown to White were also presented showing that Brown was under no obligation to him as he (White) had received as much as any other member from the Lorimer election fund and also from the jackpot, but that he would like the Senator's influence in obtaining employment in the secret service.

"This letter has never been put in evidence in any previous investigation," commented Judge E. G. Haney, counsel for Senator Lorimer, mentioning the existence of that letter before the witness was asked.

"I was not questioned about it," White replied. "Did you not realize," inquired Chairman Dillingham, "that in writing that reference to your receiving money for your vote was a confession?"

"Why did you not mention the fact that you were receiving money for your vote?" White said that he mailed this letter, but Judge Haney said he had never heard of it.

White gave the names of about fifteen of his associates in labor circles in Illinois to whom he told the story of his experiences in the Legislature. Some of these men were labor leaders and others were with whom White associated. Most of them will probably be subpoenaed by the committee in an effort to corroborate White's story.

White completed his direct testimony to-day. His cross-examination will begin when the committee reconvenes to-morrow morning.

CONFERENCE ON WOOL BILL.

An Agreement Between the Houses Is Expected.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2.—The Senate to-day agreed to a conference with the House on the Underwood-La Follette wool bill. Conference were appointed by each house. They will hold their first meeting on Friday. Most of the leaders in Congress believe that a prompt agreement will be reached.

It was the opinion around the Senate that the conference would report a bill carrying approximately 25 per cent. on raw wool and corresponding duties on the manufactures of wool. If this should not meet the favor of the Senate the conference would then probably agree on 30 per cent. on raw wool and corresponding duties on wool manufactures. It is believed there would be difficulty in passing through the Senate a bill carrying a duty lower than 30 per cent. on raw wool. It is known that Senator La Follette had difficulty in lining up his insurgent followers for a duty as low as 30 per cent.

When the compromise bill passed the Senate carrying 35 per cent. on raw wool it was with the understanding that 20 per cent. would be the basis of the compromise. Senator Penrose, chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate and one of the Senate conferees, expressed the opinion to-day that a speedy agreement would be reached by the conferees. He predicted that the bill would go to the President not later than Saturday night.

The farmers' free list bill will occasion less controversy than the wool bill. Both will be passed by the House and will be sent to the President.

The cotton bill will probably fall by being sidetracked. It is the expectation of the Senate conferees that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Finance with instructions to hold hearings on the subject and report to the Senate.

The conferees on the wool bill are expected to get the cotton bill in consideration of the insurgent support for the farmers' free list bill but in this he was unsuccessful.

The Senator from Wisconsin, it is understood, will be satisfied if he can get the wool bill and the farmers' free list bill before the President, and it is believed he is not disposed to insist on action on the cotton bill this session, but even if he insisted on it, it would not be his point. Southern Senators from the States where the cotton industry is important are determined that the cotton bill will not be considered at the extra session.

Vice-President Sherman, on motion of Senator Penrose, to-day appointed on the wool bill a committee of five members on the wool bill consisting of Senators Penrose of Pennsylvania, Cullom of Illinois, La Follette of Wisconsin, Aldrich of New York, and Simmons of North Carolina, Democrats. The latter three Senators voted for the wool bill and the former two for the cotton bill.

The conferees on the part of the House are Representatives Underwood of Alabama, Randall of Texas, Harrison of New York, and Dingley of Pennsylvania, Republicans.

There was some surprise when the chairman named Penrose and the members of the committee as the regular Republicans had said all along that they would ask to be excused from service on the conference committee. The conferees on the wool bill are expected to get the cotton bill in consideration of the insurgent support for the farmers' free list bill but in this he was unsuccessful.

The Senator from Wisconsin, it is understood, will be satisfied if he can get the wool bill and the farmers' free list bill before the President, and it is believed he is not disposed to insist on action on the cotton bill this session, but even if he insisted on it, it would not be his point. Southern Senators from the States where the cotton industry is important are determined that the cotton bill will not be considered at the extra session.

Vice-President Sherman, on motion of Senator Penrose, to-day appointed on the wool bill a committee of five members on the wool bill consisting of Senators Penrose of Pennsylvania, Cullom of Illinois, La Follette of Wisconsin, Aldrich of New York, and Simmons of North Carolina, Democrats. The latter three Senators voted for the wool bill and the former two for the cotton bill.

The conferees on the part of the House are Representatives Underwood of Alabama, Randall of Texas, Harrison of New York, and Dingley of Pennsylvania, Republicans.

There was some surprise when the chairman named Penrose and the members of the committee as the regular Republicans had said all along that they would ask to be excused from service on the conference committee. The conferees on the wool bill are expected to get the cotton bill in consideration of the insurgent support for the farmers' free list bill but in this he was unsuccessful.

The Senator from Wisconsin, it is understood, will be satisfied if he can get the wool bill and the farmers' free list bill before the President, and it is believed he is not disposed to insist on action on the cotton bill this session, but even if he insisted on it, it would not be his point. Southern Senators from the States where the cotton industry is important are determined that the cotton bill will not be considered at the extra session.

Vice-President Sherman, on motion of Senator Penrose, to-day appointed on the wool bill a committee of five members on the wool bill consisting of Senators Penrose of Pennsylvania, Cullom of Illinois, La Follette of Wisconsin, Aldrich of New York, and Simmons of North Carolina, Democrats. The latter three Senators voted for the wool bill and the former two for the cotton bill.

The conferees on the part of the House are Representatives Underwood of Alabama, Randall of Texas, Harrison of New York, and Dingley of Pennsylvania, Republicans.

There was some surprise when the chairman named Penrose and the members of the committee as the regular Republicans had said all along that they would ask to be excused from service on the conference committee. The conferees on the wool bill are expected to get the cotton bill in consideration of the insurgent support for the farmers' free list bill but in this he was unsuccessful.

The Senator from Wisconsin, it is understood, will be satisfied if he can get the wool bill and the farmers' free list bill before the President, and it is believed he is not disposed to insist on action on the cotton bill this session, but even if he insisted on it, it would not be his point. Southern Senators from the States where the cotton industry is important are determined that the cotton bill will not be considered at the extra session.

MILD CENSURE FOR DR. WILEY.

HIDDEN REPORT ON REMSEN BOARD BROUGHT OUT.

President to Let Wiley Down Easy—Deputy Attorney-General Fowler Reported That the Remsen Board Was Not Formed Legally—Inquiry Goes On.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2.—President Taft will not order the dismissal of Dr. Harvey W. Wiley. The pure food expert will get off with a reprimand, which will probably be light. The President will be ready to hand down his decision in the case within a day or two.

Secretary of Agriculture Wilson has paved the way to let himself out of the Wiley mixup without any serious difference of opinion between the President and himself. The President after Secretary Wilson had failed to make any recommendation in the case in the first instance sent the papers back to him with the request that he express an official opinion.

Secretary Wilson in his review of the case steers a fairly safe course in the middle of the road. Attorney-General Wickensham's recommendation that Dr. Wiley's offense merited "condign punishment" is apparently the most embarrassing feature of the case for the President, although Mr. Taft has said repeatedly that Mr. Wickensham was passing only on the legal aspects of the case and that in any event the President always reserved the right to reject recommendations of his Cabinet officers without prejudice to them.

That the Remsen board, created by the Secretary of Agriculture, was brought into being in evasion of law is the charge that the House Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture will make in combating the findings that Dr. Wiley violated the law in agreeing to pay Dr. Rusby an amount in excess of that prescribed by statute for expert services. This was indicated at the hearing of the committee to-day when there was produced a report of Assistant Attorney-General Fowler.

The report held that there was no authority in law for the creation of the Remsen board, which has come to be known as the "benzene soda board."

Attorney-General Wickensham and Dr. Ira Remsen, chairman of the board which bears his name, appeared before the committee to-day. The Attorney-General was asked to certify the Fowler report which was made on March 31, 1908. Where the Fowler report came from was not made known by the committee.

"I do not know from what source you have procured the paper which you have handed to me," said Attorney-General Wickensham, "but I have had it compared with the original, have certified it, and return it herewith. I should add that this is one of several memoranda which were prepared for attorneys connected with the department, all of which took into consideration in arriving at an opinion."

The opinion of Attorney-General Wickensham was that the creation of the board was perfectly legal but he did not pass upon the legality of the administrative acts of the board.

The creation of the Remsen board, which held the authority of law, said in part: "I do not think that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by law to employ these scientific experts to be paid out of the fund named (pure food appropriation). I do not think that the appropriation which these gentlemen are being paid for their services is available for that purpose."

Continuing Mr. Fowler quoted from debates in the House and the Senate at the time the bill was passed in support of his contention that Congress never intended that there should be a referee board. It was the intention of Congress, Mr. Fowler argued, to have appeals taken to the courts if there were to be appeals. Mr. Fowler further reported to the Attorney-General that the House and the Senate had passed laws and really made the Remsen board a court of last resort, which was contrary to law.

Notwithstanding my belief that a head of a department should be allowed a free hand in controlling his affairs, yet from a legal standpoint I find myself unable to concur in the view of the Secretary of Agriculture that the law authorizes the creation of this board," commented Mr. Fowler.

Mr. Remsen gave testimony concerning the activities of the board in investigating the benzene soda question and other inquiries under his direction. Dr. Remsen will resume his testimony to-morrow.

LINCOLN MEMORIAL DESIGN.

Henry Bacon, New York Architect, Chosen to Make It.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2.—President Taft to-day announced that Henry Bacon, a New York architect, has been selected by the Fine Arts Commission to design the Lincoln memorial to be erected in Potomac Park in this city under the \$2,000,000 appropriation now authorized.

Mr. Bacon was the unanimous choice of the Fine Arts Commission and he has been chosen by the Lincoln Memorial Commission to make a design that would appropriately occupy the site in Potomac Park now practically agreed upon.

NEW ATTACKS ON HOKE SMITH.

Opponents Use Farmers' Free List Bill as Extent to Ask Him to Act.

ATLANTA, Aug. 2.—Two efforts to force Governor Smith to leave the State to vacate the office of Governor and assume the duties of United States Senator or to relinquish his claim on the Senatorial seat were made in the Legislature to-day. These efforts are the direct result of the defeat of the House farmers' free list in the United States Senate by a tie vote. The opponents of Gov. Smith allege that if he had been in the Senate where, they say, he ought to have been, the free list bill would have been passed without the Remsen amendment.

The Remsen amendment was introduced urging that he at once leave the Governor's chair and go on to the Senate. In the House a resolution was introduced to declare the office of Senator vacant because Mr. Smith had failed to assume it. Both resolutions must lie on the table until Thursday.

Governor Smith declines to leave the State to vacate the office of Governor and assume the duties of United States Senator or to relinquish his claim on the Senatorial seat. He is not disposed to leave the State to vacate the office of Governor and assume the duties of United States Senator or to relinquish his claim on the Senatorial seat. He is not disposed to leave the State to vacate the office of Governor and assume the duties of United States Senator or to relinquish his claim on the Senatorial seat.

Money, deposits in bank, shares of stock, bonds, notes, credits, evidences of an interest in property and evidences of debt belonging to non-residents, are no longer subject to an inheritance tax in New York State.

Non-residents may now suit their convenience and keep their securities in New York.

The Mercantile Safe Deposit Co.
120 Broadway
Established 1875
Sales \$5 to \$800 a year
Copy of this Amendment sent on request

O'GORMAN'S FORMAL SPEECH.

Last Rites Take Place at Holy Trinity Church in Brooklyn.

THE NEW SENATOR SPEAKS FOR A LARGER HOUSE.

Favors the Reapportionment Bill Because the House at Present Is of a High Quality—Other Nations Have Big Houses—Most and Burton Oppose.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2.—The reapportionment bill increasing the membership of the House of Representatives from 391 to 433, which is the unfinished business before the Senate, was called up this afternoon by Senator Shively of Indiana. Senator O'Gorman of New York took the floor and made the opening argument in support of the bill.

This was Senator O'Gorman's first speech in the Senate and his argument was followed with keen interest by every one in the chamber. There was nothing about the manner of delivery to indicate the jurist, for although the speech was read it was read with considerable emphasis and some rhetorical effect.

The Democratic Senator from New York paid high tribute to the present House of Representatives, whose record he said gave it clear title to the respect of the people. He continued:

"I am frank to say that I would be opposed to this bill if the conditions prevailing in the Fifty-ninth and Sixtieth Congresses were to continue, but the present House has justified the confidence of the people. It will be known in the history of American legislation as a body that has been responsive to the needs of the nation."

The Senator discussed the effect of the proposed increase in the House membership upon the size of the next electoral college, which will be increased by 102 members, but insisted this was no argument against the bill. The reapportionment bill of the House was more important than this, he contended.

"Other nations with less population than the United States believe in very much larger parliaments," said Senator O'Gorman. "The United Kingdom with 41,000,000 people has a Parliament of 670 members. Austria with a population of 26,000,000 has 510 members in its Parliament. France with 39,000,000 of people has a Parliament of 584 members, and Italy with only 32,000,000 of people has 640 members."

Mr. O'Gorman reminded his colleagues that while the reapportionment affected the House only the Senate "had more than its share of interest in the matter." He declared that it was the duty of the Senate to see to it that the House was sustained in its effort to retain its representative character without delay. He said in conclusion:

Senator Root in a vigorous speech registered his opposition to the proposed bill. He said that the House of Representatives composed of 433 members was too large and unwieldy to be effective. He said that all the members of the House were not equally qualified to do the work of the House. He said that the House was too large and unwieldy to be effective.

Senator Burton of Ohio in opposing any increase in the House membership said the House was at present too large. He urged the possibilities of machine government, corruption, and loss of efficiency of a large representative body. He quoted at length from debates of the past over reapportionment bills, and quoted extracts from speeches by Senator Elias Wright of New York, John C. Calhoun of South Carolina and Mr. Buchanan, later President of the United States. A disproportionate increase in the membership of the House, he said, threatened the balance provided by the Constitution to the actions and authority of the two branches of Congress. The larger membership of a legislative body, said he, the fewer the men who would in reality direct the course of legislation.

BLAZE IN CHERRY STREET.

Bowling Balls Go Up, but Chickens Escape Broiler's Fate.

Chief John Kenon yesterday afternoon went to his first two alarm fire as head of the New York Fire Department. The blaze was in a three story factory building at 508 Cherry street. The building was used as a workshop for S. Rothberg & Co., who were doing work for the Atlas Woodworking Company, and the ground floor as a storage for chickens by Louis